



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,020	11/26/2003	Stephen C. Evans	5681-74800	7260
58467	7590	12/05/2008		
MHKKG/SUN				
P.O. BOX 398				
AUSTIN, TX 78767				
			EXAMINER	
			LIM, KRISNA	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2453		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		12/05/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/724,020

Applicant(s)

EVANS ET AL.

Examiner

Krisna Lim

Art Unit

2453

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. Claims 1-12 and 14 are still pending for examination, and claims 13 and 15 were canceled.

Applicant's arguments, see the applicant's remark, filed 08/01/08, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Garrett have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Garrett in view of Parmar.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garrett et al. [U.S. Patent No. 6,877,033] in view of Parmar et al. [U.S. Pub 2003/0023711]. Garrett et al. was used in the previous office action and Parmar et al. was cited as pertinent art in the previous office too.

4. Garrett et al. discloses (e.g., see Figs. 1-12) the invention substantially as claimed. Taking claim 1 as an exemplary claim, the reference discloses a method of generating identification information relating to a component of a computer network (e.g., generating one or more "suggested component" web page, col. 4 (lines 4-5); online identification ... components, col. 2 (lines 52-53)) having an associated memory storing a first set of data items relating to the component (e.g., see Figs. 5A-5G, 6), comprising retrieving one or more of said first set of data items (e.g., 502 of Fig. 5A) from said associated memory and generating said identifying information (part no. of Figs. 5D-5F) from said retrieved data items.

While Garrett et al. discloses a component determination module 112 to determine the components that could be used to build a circuit ... and generates one or more "suggested component" **web pages** (e.g., see col. 4 (lines 1-67), Garrett et al. does not explicitly mention that the built circuit and the "suggested component" web pages relate to the component of a computer network to the extent of the claimed language. Parmar et al. on the other hand clearly discloses a policy based network management system to identify one or more policies (e.g., a device type, a device group, etc., see paragraph 0014) associated with a network component (e.g., a network device, a device group, a device subgroup, a user, an application, An end-host, etc., see the abstract). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to combine the teaching of Parmar et al. into Garrett et al. because both of them are directed to the use of the table lookup in order to retrieve the information (e.g., see Figs. 4 and 6 of Garrett and Fig. 6 of Parmar) and Parmar clearly discloses that the information is related to the network component.

5. As to claim 2, Garrett et al discloses said identification information is generated in a first network component (e.g., see col. 1 (lines 53-67), col. 4 (lines 39-61) in response to a request from a network management application program running in a second network component (a browser of a client, col. 1 (lines 53-67)).

6. As to claim 3, Garrett et al. retrieving data (e.g., link 502 of Fig. 5A, col. 8, lines 19-23) from a memory associated with said first network component or with another network component, and adding said further data (e.g., see suffix 3.3 adding to LM2672, col. 4 (line 58), col. 5, also see suffix adding to LM2575 part number of Fig. 5D to 5F) as a suffix to said retrieved data to generate said identifying information (part number of Figs. 5D or 5F).

7. As to claim 4, Garrett et al discloses said generated identification information is sent from said first network component (e.g., see col. 1 (lines 53-67), col. 4 (lines 39-

61)) to said second network component (a browser of a client, col. 1 (lines 53-67)).

8. As to claim 5, Garret et al discloses said associated memory is an ID PROM (e.g., see col. 9, lines 41-48)) and said first set of data items includes at least one of a manufacturer's part number, a serial number, and an equipment type descriptor (e.g., see Part Number, Type, Model, etc. in Figs. 5D-5F, see all components of Fig. 6).

9. As to claim 6, Garret et al discloses a computer network component comprising a processor and a memory (e.g., see processor 1204 and memory (1206, 1208 and 1210 of Fig. 12) wherein the memory stores machine-implementable instructions executable by the processor to carry out the method of claim 1

10. Claims 7-12 and 14 are similar in scope as of claims 1-6, and therefore claims 7-12 and 14 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above for claims 1-6.

11. The rejections are respectfully maintained and incorporated by reference as set forth in the last office action with some modification due to the amendment filed 2/5/08.

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 and 14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

12.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The references are cited in the Form PTO-892 for the applicant's review.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Art Unit: 2453

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Krisna Lim whose telephone number is 571-272-3956. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne, can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KI

December 02, 2008

/Krisna Lim/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2453